



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,836	12/24/2003	Hirokazu Sakai	247085US0	1132
22850	7590	01/25/2010		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET			VENKAT, JYOTHSNA A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1619	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/25/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/743,836	SAKAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT	1619	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

(1) JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT. (3) _____.

(2) Richard Chin. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 September 2009

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 and obviousness-type double patenting rejection over U. S. Patent 7,544,648 ('648)

Claims discussed:

as of record

Prior art documents discussed:

as of record.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/JYOTHSNA A VENKAT /
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1619

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed the attorney that based upon applicants' remarks with respect to unexpected results in the specification, application is in condition for allowance subjecting to submission of terminal disclaimer over patent '648 since the instant claims are obvious over the claims of the patent and co-pending application 12/406,170 and incorporating into claim 1, 0.2-3 % of amphipathic amide lipid A and B in Markush group; incorporating 10-22% of anionic surfactant mixture, which is sodium polyoxyethylene (2) lauryl ether sulfate and sodium lauryl sulfate; incorporating 0.5-2 % of lactic acid and malic acid; incorporating cationic polymers in Markush group format, which are cationized hydroxyethyl cellulose and cationized guar gum and incorporating 0.1-5 % for cationic polymer and incorporating non-ionic surfactant, which is cocoylmonoethanolamide and the amount as 0.1-5 % and cancelling the claims that are redundant. Attorney agreed. Examiner requested the attorney to send the amendment to central fax. Attorney agreed. Examiner reviewed the claims and informed the attorney that claims are not allowable since the amendment of 9/14/09 did not recite the specific anionic surfactant mixture and amendment did not recite in claim 1 specific cationic polymers and specific non-ionic surfactant. Attorney agreed to send another amendment. This amendment was not allowable since claim 1 did not incorporate specific cationic polymers and specific non-ionic surfactant. Attorney informed the examiner that claims can be amended by examiners amendment. Attorney did not agree to delete "salt" after lactic acid and malic acid. Examiner informed the attorney claims recite acid and there are no test results for salts. Attorney did not agree to amend the claims of 9/22/08 with respect to deleting "salt" after malic acid, therefore prosecution is resumed. .